

Appl. No. 10/634,639
Amdt. Date: March 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed September 21, 2004 in the above-captioned application.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by White et al. (4,793,738). Reconsideration is respectfully requested. It is believed that claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for the reasons hereinafter set forth.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to include damping means mounted on the floating platform for inhibiting platform resonance motions. As noted by the Examiner, White et al. fails to disclose damping means for inhibiting platform resonance motions (office action page 4, paragraph 4). It is believed therefore that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is not proper and it is respectfully requested that it be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Clims 2, 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. in view of Salama et al. (4,990,030) and claims 5-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. in view of Phelan et al. (US2002/0170792A1). As noted by the Examiner, White et al. fails to disclose damping means for inhibiting platform resonance motions (office action page 4, paragraph 4). Salama et al. and Phelan et al. likewise fail to teach, show or suggest damping means mounted on the platform. While Phelan et al. discloses damper bands that may be secured about cable stays, Phelan et al. does not teach, show or disclose


Appl. No. 10/634,639
Amdt. Date: March 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2004

damping means mounted on a platform separate from the cable stays. The proposed modification to White et al. therefore fails to teach, show or disclose the applicant's invention as claimed in amended claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom. It is believed therefore that the rejection of claims 2-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is not proper and it is respectfully requested that it be withdrawn.

The citation of the prior art made of record and not relied upon is noted. However, it is believed that the prior art not relied upon is no more pertinent than the applied references, and therefore a detailed discussion of the prior art not relied upon is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to the outstanding office action.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Nick A. Nichols, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,573

Nick A. Nichols, Jr., P.C.
P. O. Box 16399
Sugar Land, TX 77496-6399
281-494-8331